DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 238 FL 010 887

AUTHOR Valencia, Atilano A.: And Others
TITLE Bilingual Education: A Vehicle for Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Two Presentations in the College of Education, Dialogue Series.
INSTITUTION New Mexico State Univ., Las Cruces. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE 8 Feb 79
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS American Indians; *Bilingual Education; *Educational Assessment; Federal Regulation; Integrated Curriculum; Language Attitudes; Language Instruction; Mexican Americans; *Models; *Multicultural Education; Program Descriptions; *State Programs; Student Teaching; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Bilingual Programs; New Mexico

ABSTRACT

Two papers on bilingual education are included. "The Emerging Features of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education in the U.S.A." by Atilano A. Valencia represents an overview of the development of programs and policies to meet the needs of bilingual students in the United States. The federal legislation and key court decisions of the 1960s that were responsible for mandating bilingual instruction are reviewed. Reasons for incomplete success in implementing these mandates are discussed. These reasons include slow development of bilingual teacher training and material development centers, which are only now beginning to meet demand; and continued public reluctance to discard old attitudes which view bilingual education as at best frivolous and at worst a social threat. In "Bilingual/Bicultural Teacher Education: An Approach," Robert L. Gallegos and Roy C. Rodriguez discuss bilingual/bicultural teacher training in New Mexico, which is offered as a model for other programs. Elements of the model include: (1) public school cooperation in providing student teaching opportunities; (2) assessment of student teacher needs; (3) weekly lesson plans consisting of units designed to meet specific (often interdisciplinary) learning objectives; and (4) evaluative conferences between instructors and student teachers, following completion of the program. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED180238

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Roy C. Rodriguez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BILINGUAL EDUCATION:

A VEHICLE FOR BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM

Two Presentations in the College of Education

DIALOGUE SERIES

New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico

The Emerging Features of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education In the U.S.A.

by

Atilano A. Valencia, Ph.D.
College of Education
New Mexico State University

Bilingual/Bicultural Teacher Education: An Approach

by

Robert L. Gallegos, Ph.D.
College of Education
New Mexico State University

and

Roy C. Rodriguez, Ph.D.
College of Education
New Mexico State University

February 8, 1979

FL010887

THE EMERGING FEATURES OF BILINGUALISM

AND

BILINGUAL EDUCATION IN THE U.S.A.

Antecedents and Revival of Bilingual Education

Bilingualism is a natural phenomenon in regions where two or more languages come in contact. People in many nations speak more than one language with varying degrees of proficiency. And not all of the nations of the world carry the notion of maintaining a monolingual society based only in the national language.

Because of the migration of people to the United States from many parts of the world, various languages have been spoken and continue to persist in this part of the world. Thus bilingualism has occurred in the United States due to the contact of several languages, and degree of monolingualism and bilingualism often is dependent on the extent of exposure to either or both languages.

There is historical evidence, based on documents found in church records, court records, governmental archives, newspapers, etc., that prior to 1890, some cultural groups in the United States received instruction and literature in languages other than English. Thus, bilingualism and bilingual education are not a novelty in the last three decades of this century. It is noted historically, however, that the acculturation of many non-English speaking groups in terms of the national language was accentuated following the United State's involvement in three foreign wars--The Spanish-American War (1898), World War I (1917-18), and World War II (1941-45). Yet, bilingualism has persisted among several cultural

groups in the nation despite the rapid acculturation that occurred among the descendants of most European immigrant groups. Native language maintenance especially is found among the Hispanic groups, the French near the Canadian border and in some parts of Louisiana, and among the Native American Indians. Some Asiatic languages also have been carried, especially in the western part of the country. Still other examples may be found in other parts of the nation. The significant point is that, despite the rapid acculturation that occurred after 1890, bilingualism is still a phenomenon in this country.

The American school system, particularly in the past six decades, has provided curricula principally based in American English and related cultural references and values. Languages other than English have been viewed as foreign. Yet, Americans familiar with American history know that Spanish, French and various Native American Indian languages were spoken before English in various regions now considered the United States. It appears that in regions where institutional, governmental, and societal processes were conducted in a language other than English prior to the immigration of English-speaking Americans, the speakers of languages other than English have not viewed their languages as foreign. While English was adopted through formal schooling and contact with English-speaking Americans, the native languages of these groups have persisted. And because of the absence of formal instruction in their native languages, many descendents of these early non-English speakers are "compound bilinguals." These descendents either use the native language or a compound bilingual mode with other bilinguals from the same cultural group. Due

to this occurrence, many of these young people encounter language difficulties when they enter a school system conducted solely in the national language--English. Research data (Cardenas, 1971) continue to show that these children experience slower academic progress in the beginning school years, and also score lower than monolingual English speakers in tests especially designed in the language and cultural values of the latter.

Educators in the 1960's pressed for conferences to review the educational needs of children whose communication system is different than that of the monolingual English-speaking American. These conferences highlighted the rationale that "bilingual education is based on the notion that the rapidity with which the child internalizes and applies concepts and skills is significantly related to the language and cultural background of the child" (Valencia, 1976). Bilingual education was viewed as a desirable alternative to the difficulty encountered by a non-English-speaking child in his exposure to the educational processes in the American monolingual-monocultural curriculum. It was these and other efforts that provided the impetus toward the passage of Federal legislation in support of bilingual education programs for children with little or no English-speaking ability, and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U. S. Office of Education, Title VII Bilingual Education fund was created. As a consequence, school districts in different parts of the nation submitted proposals and acquired Federal funds for the development and implementation of bilingual education for these children. Other districts followed, while the original recipients continued to

expand their programs to include additional schools and more advanced grade levels.

Recently, Federal courts have directly addressed issues concerning the rights of limited English-speaking students in Federally assisted schools. In Lau vs. Nichols, 414 U.S. 463 (1974), "the Supreme Court relied on Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964--generally worded anti-discimination statute--to invalidate the de facto exclusion of non-English-speaking students from Federally assisted education programs" (Geffert, et al., 1975). In essence, the Court held that a California public school district receiving funds must provide a viable instructional medium whenever student members of non-English-speaking minorities are enrolled in large numbers in the district's schools. While the Court's decision on this case did not specifically prescribe that an educational program must be based on a bilingual mode, it nonetheless provided the basis for subsequent legislation in support of bilingual education. Further substantiation for the rights of children to be afforded bilingual instruction is found in the Serna vs. Portales, 499F. 2d 1149 (10th Cr. 1974), where "the court relied on Lau and affirmed trial judges' discretionary power to order bilingual programs as a remedy in a Title VI case--at least where the only alternative remedial plan presented the trial court was a 'token plan that would not benefit' the plaintiff students" (Geffert, et al., 1975).

In addition to the anti-discrimination provision of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, several other statutes have encouraged the furtherance of bilingual education. Among them have been the Title I and

Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. In recent years, however, the major source of Federal monies for bilingual education has been the Bilingual Education Act, Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendment of 1967 (amended in 1974).

Legislation in favor of bilingual instruction has recently occurred in several states of the Union. To date, 22 states have statutes which expressly or implicitly permit school districts to offer courses in a language other than English (Geffert, et al., 1975). Among them are Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington. Other states are expected to follow this trend.

Further, several states, among them California, New Mexico, and Massachusetts, have provided State Department of Education guidelines for the credentialing of bilingual education teachers. These are expected to have immediate implication for the provision of teacher training programs in these states, especially in colleges and universities partly supported by state funds. In these geographical areas, bilingual education in the United States is no longer a "dream" but a reality.

Implementation Concerns and Issues

In the early implementation stages, many districts simply placed bilingual education teachers in programs and requested that instruction be extended in two selected languages. Many of the teachers had little or no idea about the underlying racionale for bilingual education, had never experienced delivering instruction in any language other than

English, and had little or no instructional materials and media in the native language of the child. The end-of-year evaluation studies conducted for these districts quickly revealed these needs (Valencia, 1971).

Surveys and evaluation reports continued to reflect a need for the retraining of teachers to improve their bilingual education skills and the preparation of new bilingual teachers for service in bilingual education classrooms. Consequently, Federal funding was extended for districts with Title VII programs to include inservice training for their teachers. This was followed with Title VII Federal funds to institutions of higher education interested in providing training programs for new and experienced teachers who needed further training in bilingual education. Today, institutions of higher education in different parts of the nation have ongoing programs for the preparation of bilingual education teachers. The majority are based in English and Spanish; however, a few selected institutions also offer training programs in French/English, Portuguese/English, and Cantonese/English. It is expected that other languages will be included as colleges and universities increase their bilingual education teacher training capabilities.

Because of the continuous demand for bilingual teacher training resources and institutes to meet the immediate and emergent needs expressed by school districts throughout the nation, the Resource and Training Centers were funded and supported through Title VII, U.S.O.E. funds. Presently, Resource and Training Centers are found in the states of California, New Mexico, Texas, Louisiana, Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Washington. Others are expected to be funded in geographical areas with acute needs.

The capabilities of some institutions of higher education in providing well-balanced teacher training programs is still a questionable variable. In many instances, the unavailability of well-prepared bilingual faculty poses a problem. This concern is compounded with the need for additional reference materials for professors and students alike. The 1975 provision of Title VII funds, followed with additional appropriations in 1976 and 1977, to extend fellowship grants to graduate students interested in careers as bilingual education teacher trainers represents an effort to fill this void. It is expected that the demand for both bilingual education teachers and teacher trainers will continue several years hence.

Because of the need for bilingual-bicultural materials, curriculum development centers were initially funded through resources allocated by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Office of Education. Among them were the Spanish Curricula Development Center in Dade County, Florida, the Bilingual Curriculum Development Center in Albuquerque, New Mexico, and the Curriculum Adaptation Network for Bilingual Education located in several regions of the country. Several other centers have been established in recent years through Title VII funds. Some of these centers are located in Berkeley, Pomona, and Alahambra, California; Tucson, Arizona; Austin, Dallas, and Fort Worth, Texas; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Urbana, Illinois; Bedford, New Hampshire; Providence, Rhode Island; Bronx, New York; and South Orange, New Jersey. Other bilingual materials have been developed and tested by regional laboratories, with funds principally drawn from Federal appropriations. In the meantime, creative

teachers in school districts in Title VII projects have been developing their own materials and instructional guides.

Although materials are being developed, school district evaluation reports show that many teachers need further information on where and how to acquire materials. This need resulted in the funding of the Assessment and Dissemination Centers in 1975 and 1976, which are presently located in Los Angeles, California; Austin, Texas; and Falls River, Massachusetts.

Yet, the tremendous demand for a variety and quantity of bilingual materials revealed the need for a special type of center for collecting, distributing and retrieving information. For this reason, several conferences, sponsored jointly by the National Institute of Education and the U. S. Office of Bilingual Education, were held in 1976 and 1977 to ascertain the need for a national bilingual education clearinghouse. It is anticipated that the provision of Federal funds for the creation and establishment of this type of service will enhance the extension and availability of bilingual education materials on a wider range and scope. It also is expected that this type of entity will form a linkage with existing centers to facilitate and expedite acquisition and dissemination processes.

Other concerns relative to the institutionalization of bilingual education are found in the degree of commitment by school people and community groups. In these situations, bilingual education simply has been viewed as a special and compensatory program. It has been envisaged as a program designed to merely get non English-speaking children "over the

hump." Thus, a phasing-out process in bilingual education is anticipated by these groups.

There are several reasons for the resistance still apparent in some school systems and communities. First, there are groups in every community who are supportive of the traditional idea of the "model American" based on the "melting pot" myth. Second, some school systems have accepted bilingual education only as long as Federal dollars are forthcoming. Third, due to the limited knowledge about the effects of bilingual instruction, many parents still have the underlying fear that bilingualism will cause negative effects on the cognitive development of children. Fourth, another group of parents harbor the fear that inclusion of the child's native language in the curriculum will develop and accentuate a non-English accent among their children, which will limit their opportunities for social and economic success in our English-speaking American society. And fifth, another group believes that enough Federal dollars and special opportunities have been extended to minority cultural groups and, therefore, advocate the discontinuance of such priorities in education.

The chances for bilingual education's survival depend on several alternatives that educators and legislators must continue to envisage. First, inservice training in bilingual education must be extended to persons in the field in terms of identified needs; second, increased effort must be exhibited by school systems to enlist local and state resources to extend and maintain bilingual education in the respective districts; third, school systems, institutions of higher education and

other agencies involved in bilingual education must give increased attention to using informational materials, media, and community conferences to enhance total community awareness and understanding about the principals and advantages of bilingual education; fourth, continuous local, State and Federal support is needed to further research and dissemination of bilingual literature and materials on a multiplicity of topics, disciplines, educational levels and cultural groups.

Additionally, teachers and educators must continue to search for innovative instructional strategies and techniques for application in bilingual-bicultural settings. They must continue to gain knowledge about instructional activities which will promote a better understanding and relationship among children from various ethnic and socio-economic groups. Colleges and universities must provide the resources and facilities to extend preservice and inservice training programs on campus and in the field to better prepare school personnel who anticipate working or are working with children in bilingual learning environments.

It will take continuous effort and commitment by school systems, teacher training institutions, communities, and governmental agencies for bilingual education to become an integral and continuous component in our American educational system. The issues and concerns are clear--the alternatives are explicit.

REFERENCES

Cardenas, Jose. Testimony to the United States District Court. Tyler, Texas, 1971.

Geffert, H. N., et al. The current status of bilingual education legislation. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics, May 1975.

Valenica, A. A. Bilingual education for the Spanish-English bilingual. Berkeley: BABEL Productions, 1976.

Valencia. A. A. Bilingual/bicultural education---an effective learning shceme for first and second grade Spanish-speaking, English-speaking, and American Indian children in New Mexico. A Report of Statistical Findings and Recommendations for the Grant's Bilingual Education Project. Albuquerque: The Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, 1971.

BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL TEACHER EDUCATION:

AN APPROACH

by

Robert L. Gallegos, Ph.D.
College of Education
New Mexico State University

and

Roy C. Rodriguez, Ph.D.
College of Education
New Mexico State University

February 8, 1979

BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL TEACHER EDUCATION:

AN APPROACH

Introduction

New Mexico's multilingual, multicultural character is reflected in New Mexico State Department of Education figures for 1973-74. Those figures indicated that minority groups accounted for 51.7 percent of all children; that in nine districts, one-quarter or more students were Native American; that in 38 districts over 50 percent of all students had Spanish surnames; that for 41 percent of the children, two languages were spoken in the home.

Certainly not all the children reflected in these figures are receiving bilingual schooling. Furthermore, unilingual children who wish to receive bilingual schooling may not necessarily acquire it. Both of these groups are victims of today's society and its school system which does not give status to bilingualism and its vehicle, bilingual education.

Bilingual education has a centuries-long history. Andersson and Boyer (1978) state the following:

> Bilingual schooling is of great antiquity, dating back to the fourth millennium before our era. At that time, the co-existing literate cultures of the ancient world and the century-long transition from one dominant civilization to another created situations where bilingual schooling seemed normal. Eblaites, Sumerians, Babylonians, Akkadians, Egyptians, Aramaens, Hittites, and Phoenicians - to name only these - all seem to have maintained some form of bilingual education.

In the United States, education in a language other than English has a well-established history. There is evidence of Dutch bilingual schools about 1776, of French bilingual schools in the Northwest Territory

around 1796, and English/German bilingual schools in Maryland near 1874 (Andersson and Boyer, 1978). Sprinkled among these were many other bilingual schools, and to underscore the concept, it should be stated that the first journal of education to be published in the United States, in 1839, was in the German language (Andersson and Boyer, 1978).

These are not the best known eras of bilingual education in the United States. The period from 1840 to 1920 is better known; the period beginning near 1963 and emphasizing Spanish/English and Native American language/English programs is best known. In none of these aforementioned eras of bilingual education, however, is there any significant literature pertaining to the preparation of the bilingual classroom teacher.

The State of Bilingual Education Teacher Training

Even today, a dearth of information exists regarding college and university programs in bilingual/bicultural education teacher training. Gradually, a library of literature is developing regarding the status of bilingual programs in the public schools, the quality of materials being produced, the political and social impact of bilingual programs, and the possible educational value of these bilingual programs to (bilingual/bicultural) children.

Beginning with the academic year, 1979, the State of New Mexico will require that classroom teachers in bilingual/bicultural classrooms possess State certification in this particular area. New Mexico is just one in a growing list of states that are moving toward formalizing teacher training in the bilingual area.

A major concern among public school administrators has been the continued exit (from teacher training programs) of teachers with minimal skills for bilingual instruction. Acosta and Blanco (1978) imply that a reason for the marginal skill development of teachers occurs because, generally, teacher education programs are campus-based, allowing little time for students to interact with children in the latter's setting. Most programs do provide, they state, one field experience. However, it appears that future teachers, in order to insure a more complete development, will need to have maximum contact with quality bilingual education programs.

Thus, colleges and universities involved in bilingual/bicultural education teacher training must develop curriculum methods which will assist student teachers in development of bilingual teaching modules, proper Spanish vocabulary, incorporate bicultural concepts, and organize a teaching day in such a manner that bilingual/bicultural education is practiced.

A Teacher Education Approach

The concept presented herein and in operation in the bilingual/bicultural teacher education program at New Mexico State University utilizes an integrated content approach. This concept attempts to integrate social studies, fine arts, math, science, and language arts, which includes reading. In the past, these areas have commonly been taught independently with a definite emphasis on either the language or the culture. The emphasis in this program is cognitive, with thinking skills as a

primary goal. This program goal is well-supported by Raths (1967) when he states the following:

> . . . and then a time came when man could plan not just to live--but to live better. And this called for the recognition of new alternatives, for the dreaming of dreams and the alteration of the environment in pursuit of the dreams. Man became social, and in that process he also created social problems. These problems in turn called for solutions, and man's thinking was again challenged. There was, and there continues to be, no end to the problems which confront mankind, and the need to emphasize thinking in the education of children was never so urgent as it is today.

The thinking skills utilized in this approach come from various sources. Raths (1967) presents comparing, summarizing, observing, classifying, interpreting, criticizing, looking for assumptions, imagining, collecting and organizing data, hypothesizing, applying principals, decision-making, designing, and coding. Bloom (1969), summarized, presents knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. According to Carin and Sund (1970), the American Association for the Advancement of Science emphasizes the following in their elementary school program: observing, classifying, using space/time relations, using numbers, communicating, measuring, predicting, inferring, formulating hypotheses, controlling variables, experimenting, defining operationally, formulating models, and interpeting data. In Reading Is Only the Tiger's Tail, McCracken (1972) presents these as thinking skills relative to language arts, including reading: getting the main idea, understanding words in context, recalling details, remembering the sequence of events, recognizing cause and effect, making inferences, drawing conclusions, predicting outcomes, following directions, summarizing and outlining.

A second feature of the approach gives emphasis to language of two types. First and obviously, Spanish is stressed but as the program is developmental in nature, the skill levels of all students are embraced and an effort is made to lift these. Secondly, there is an emphasis on question formation/asking.

A third feature of the approach is the selection of materials. Wissler (1923), Linton (1955), Zintz (1969), White (1959), Kluckholm (1957), and Aragon (1973) all imply the importance of culture in everyday activities of man. Montagu (1968) explains culture as the man-made, the learned, part of the environment. He adds further:

> Man's basic needs must still be physically satisfied. He must eat, drink, sleep, rest, exercise, eliminate . . . But even here, the manner in which man satisfies his basic needs is largely culturally determined and to a much greater extent than is customarily understood.

Montagu's expression of culture is profound and far-reaching and causes us to emphasize cultural materials in our program. As Montagu perceives culture, it is the framework out of which an individual functions almost entirely, including education. It supports the advancement of a <u>culturally based</u> education which can be expanded. But for the young learner, culture provides the experiences upon which a much broader concept of education can be based.

Lastly, it must be underscored that this program places the child at the focus of our attention. The teacher's language, the materials selected and the learning environment structured along with the development of thinking skills are all designed with that learner in mind.

The authors of this paper would be remiss if they did not also state that their learners, the college undergraduate students, are most important. This entire program is designed to put them in control of their learning with support from their teachers, New Mexico State University faculty members. This is attempted through a combination of theory and practice and through a series of steps designed to assess their needs in each of the content areas, followed by an attempt at skill development in teaching.

Bilingual Teacher Education: A Model

Since bilingual teacher education is a relatively new and unsearched area, the time is ripe for extensive explorations and revisions of programs. In New Mexico State University's approach, the student teacher is presented with materials, concepts, vocabulary, teaching strategy, lesson planning, and numerous other preparatory and theoretical information in the University classroom. Furthermore, the student teacher is required to develop and report on materials that could be and will be presented to public school children in bilingual education classrooms. Finally, the student teacher is required to take her/his lesson and present it to bilingual education children in their classroom.

The essential elements of the teacher education model used at New Mexico State University incorporates the following:

1. Public school cooperation.
2. Needs assessment of bilingual student teachers.
3. The approach.
4. Conference/evaluation.

A review of each element of the bilingual/bicultural teacher education program model is presented below.

1. Public School Cooperation. As indicated before, in their work on competencies for bilingual/bicultural education teachers, Acosta and Blanco (1978) have indicated that " . . . future teachers . . . should be given a maximum of contact with quality bilingual education programs . . . at local schools . . ." This concept has been a guide in the development of the bilingual teacher education program discussed here.

The willing cooperation of the bilingual education teachers in the Las Cruces and Gadsden Public School Districts, New Mexico, has been the catalyst for the development of this program. Their willingness to open public school classrooms to University students has made it possible for student teachers to work with bilingual children as they develop materials and teaching strategies.

Certainly, there was considerable convincing and persuading of public school personnel (both teachers and administrators) before cooperation was extended. Bilingual education faculty had to prove to all involved that not only would student teachers benefit from this instructional approach but, equally important, the bilingual children would be exposed to a broader variety of lessons.

Bilingual faculty needed to indicate that the student teachers would be prepared to work with the children on every visitation the student teachers made to the classroom. Certain guidelines were given to each participating teacher. These guidelines were to be followed by all student teachers for full University classroom credit. Among these:

a. A fully developed unit with activities for a three-to-four week period.

b. Daily lesson plans indicating what was to be presented that particular day or the next day the student teacher would visit.

c. The development of a schedule that the student teacher would follow punctually.

d. Adequate and comprehensive supervision of each student teacher and their activities.

In addition, public school classroom teachers and administrators received assurance that lessons pertaining to language arts, social studies, and fine arts would be culturally relevant to Spanish/English bilingual children. Also, lessons pertaining to math and science would be prepared by the student teachers with sufficient activities and vocabulary in both Spanish and English at all times with the children.

With these assurances, the public school classrooms have been an excellent teaching resource for University students preparing for bilingual/bicultural education. The public school classroom has immersed the University student in a situation where they must deal with children early in their careers.

2. Needs Assessment. A beginning instruction point in any program is the recognition of the needs of the learners. In this approach, the needs of the learners were sought and were expressed in two ways. First, the students were assigned the responsibility of identifying some general teaching needs they had. These were then presented verbally in a general class session. Here, there was an expression of a general need to respond

to and work with children. From this session, also, general areas of study were identified, grouped, and written so that students could sequence them in terms of their needs. Their choices were analyzed. This prioritized list of themes then became the course goals.

3. The Approach. Units of work and weekly lesson plans became the organizers for the instruction New Mexico State University students were going to carry out. The unit framework has the following components: objectives, concepts, thinking processes or thinking skills, activities, materials, and evaluation. As the units were the major "game plan," it was required that they be specific in each component and that they have culture as an instructional vehicle where possible.

The weekly lesson plans presented further specificity in the following components: specific objective, procedures, vocabulary, and evaluation. The vocabulary component was included because it became a developmental strategy. As Spanish has not been utilized extensively as a language of instruction, a great deal of technical language needs to be developed. By including it in the weekly lesson plan, vocabulary was assured of special attention.

As a final preparation before venturing into the public school classroom, student teachers were required to present, before their University classmates, one of the lessons in their unit (micro-teaching). The intent here was to evaluate the clarity and preparation made by the students. In addition, approach and vocabulary (English/Spanish) were judged. The presentations by the students were videotaped and played back to the class. Strengths and weaknesses of the presentation were

indicated by bilingual faculty. Students were able to notice areas in their lesson that needed work or restructuring.

Perhaps the greatest task asked of the University student teachers was that they present their work before bilingual school children two or three times a week. The student teacher was forced to be disciplined in his/her preparations and ready to involve the children with varied activities.

It was the responsibility of the student teacher to provide materials and organize the classroom. The children could be involved as a whole, in small groups, or even individually. The teaching setting was in the hands of the student teacher. If the student teacher wanted to remove the children from the classroom and work with them in another setting, this was generally approved.

Materials for activities were limited only by finances and imagination. The children made musical instruments; constructed small buildings from mud or adobe; worked with leather, clay, straw, beads, and wax; designed and constructed settings for plays and talent shows; ground corn with a metate and mano; made tortillas, bread, sopapillas, posole, chile, and numerous other Southwestern and Hispanic foods.

The theme was action, manipulation, and creativity. The student teacher was placed in a position in which the children and the classroom teacher were dependent on her/him to provide new and different cultural activities within the framework of the curriculum content area.

4. Conference/evaluation. One, it became a way of finding out how the children were responding to the lesson. Secondly, it became a

way of finding out how the New Mexico State University student teacher felt about his/her performance as a teacher-in-becoming. This second point is also critical because it was utilized extensively in student-professor conferences. In turn, the conference served to keep the student in line with objectives he/she had articulated and had identified by choice at the beginning of the course. The University student was also evaluated by the master teacher informally through conversations with the professors and formally through a short inventory.

Lastly, the University student was informally evaluated several times and formally evaluated once by the professor during the course of the semester.

Conclusions

The model presented here is an effort to combine theory and practice in a bilingual/bicultural (Spanish-English) educational setting. The theoretical concepts stem from the position that learners must become actively involved and in control of their learning. This position holds true for both the children with whom New Mexico State University students work and the New Mexico State University bilingual education teachers-in-becoming. During the education program, an effort is made to model this for the New Mexico State University student while stressing the development of thinking skills in children, sophistication in the selection of materials, and the development of a person who will be the teacher of young children.

Little or no information is currently available on teaching methodology in a bilingual setting. Empirical evidence is lacking which

reflects the value of one approach over another. Educational intuition tells us, however, that if bilingual/bicultural education is to succeed and, more importantly, improve educational opportunities for Hispanic children, bilingual teachers must be versed in language and cultural diversity. The ramifications of language and cultural diversity may not be available in the university classroom alone.

In this model, bilingual education faculty at New Mexico State University have made available, to the bilingual education student teachers, the opportunity to familiarize themselves (early in their careers) with this vast diversity by allowing them to direct the education of children in two languages and cultures.

REFERENCES

Acosta, R., & Blanco, G. Competencies for university programs in bilingual education. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

Andersson, T., & Boyer, M. Bilingual schooling in the United States. Austin: National Educational Laboratory Publishers, Inc., 1978.

Aragon, J. An impediment to cultural pluralism: Culturally deficient educators attempting to teach culturally different children. In M. D. Stent, W. R. Hazard, & H. N. Rivlin (Eds.), Cultural pluralism in education: A mandate for change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1973.

Bloom, B. Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1969.

Carin, A. A., & Sund, R. B. Teaching science through discovery. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1970.

Kluckholm, C. Mirror for man. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957.

Linton, R. The tree of culture. New York: Random House, 1955.

McCracken, R. A., & McCracken, M. J. Reading is only the tiger's tail. San Rafael, California. Leswing Press, 1972.

Montagu, A. M. F. Culture: Man's adaptive dimension. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

New Mexico State Department of Education, Santa Fe, 1973-74.

Raths, L. E., Jonas, A., Rothstein, A., & Wassermann, S. Teaching for thinking: Theory and application. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1967.

White, L. The evolution of culture: The development of civilization to the fall of Rome. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Wissler, C. Man and culture. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1923.

Zintz, M. V. Education across cultures. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall-Hunt Publishing Company, 1969.